

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/814,343	SAKAGAMI ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Brian P. Werner	2621	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Brian P. Werner (SPE). (3) Alicia M. Choi (Reg. 46621).  
 (2) Elisa Rice (examiner). (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 24 October 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kuno (US 5,802,494) and Higaki (US 2004/0028260).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



**BRIAN WERNER**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an  
 Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Regarding Kuno, examiner and applicant's representative disagreed on the construction of the limitation "moving the robot toward the detected human". The examiner's position is that Kuno, who moves an arm or a portion of the robot toward a patient, meets this limitation (i.e., the entirety of the robot need not move toward the human to meet the claimed limitation). Examiner suggested clarifying the claim by adding the work "entire" to the limitation (i.e., "moving the entire robot ...").

Regarding the Higaki, the examiner pointed to paragraph 79, 85 and 89 as meeting the "human detecting" and "power drive" element.

No agreement was reached, but the examiner offered subsequent interviews to discuss specific language that would distinguish over the prior art.



**BRIAN WERNER**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**